

DRAFT MINUTES

STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS

Thursday, January 4, 2001

I. Call to Order

Mr. Gerard Killebrew called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes of August 24, 2000 Meeting

On motion of Dr. Birkett, seconded, by Dr. Joseph, the minutes of the August 24, 2000 meeting of the Council were approved as distributed. (See Appendix A.)

III. Teacher Education Initiatives

A. Status of Title II/Louisiana QUEST Grant

Dr. Jeanne Burns announced that signed contracts for FY 2000-2001 LaQUEST project subgrants have been sent to all public universities. Contracts with private institutions are still at OCR, pending approval. Dr. Burns stressed that universities must appoint PK-16+ Coordinators by Monday; those appointed will meet soon in Baton Rouge on January 25-26 for orientation and networking. Dr. Burns then described the upcoming Presidents' Forum, to be held on January 12, which is to focus on how to use PK-16+ Councils to advantage; the occasion will also be used to discuss expectations for subgrant implementation over the next three years. Dr. Burns welcomed further questions and/or requests related to all Title II/QUEST subgrants and their implementation, adding that these be can directed either to her directly or to Ms. Stephanie Williamson.

B. Update of Development of Teacher Program Accountability System

Dr. Burns reviewed recent refinements to the system and asked that any suggestions for revision be made as soon as possible. She then opened the floor to questions. Dr. Robinson asked whether universities will be held accountable for teacher retention. Dr. Burns replied yes, since retention is an index of support, this figure will go into the composite score for the university. Dr. Robinson replied that retention should be the responsibility of school districts. Questions arose about how these composite scores will be calculated; Dr. Burns reviewed the new system's formula, measures, data sources, target figures, and bonus points. Members of the Council then asked questions pertaining to how the system may or may not account for the unique character of each school's situation and structure. Following discussion, Dr. Burns directed the Council's attention to timetable issues: that the first university scores to be assigned will be issued this April; that only in 2002 will labels be affixed to those scores; and that "corrective actions" will have meaningful reform as their goal, not punishment.

Drs. Robinson and Moffett other raised concerns about the difficulties of confronting inertia (i.e., tenure) and time constraints.

Upon end of discussion, Dr. Joseph moved and Dr. Pecoraro seconded a motion for approval of the proposed Accountability System. The motion was passed without objection. (See Appendix B.)

C. Discussion Regarding Alternate Teacher Practitioner Certification

Dr. Burns announced that the BESE has approved the new “Practitioner Teacher Preparation Program” in December. Universities will be expected to use this structure. The question arose as to whether a university’s use of another university or private entity to provide alternate certification programs would compromise the first university’s NCATE accreditation. NCATE officials have stated that it is the *university as a whole*, not just the College of Education, which will be expected to meet NCATE’s expectations and standards, whatever the origin or residence of its certification and alternate-certification programs. In response to Regent Henry’s concern that a variety of program providers may not cooperate or have no incentive to cooperate with one another, Mr. Killebrew urged Colleges of Education to be a force for encouraging such cooperation, and he stressed that a consistent interpretation of NCATE standards will also be critical. Dr. Mathews suggested that private providers of alternate certification programs should not expect universities to offer credit for those programs. Dr. Moffett mentioned that Southeastern Louisiana University has coordinating procedures in place already and welcomed inquiries.

IV. Distance Learning Issues

A. Seat-Time Policy for Academic Coursework

The proposed Seat-Time Policy for Academic Coursework was approved on motion by Dr. Joseph, seconded by Dr. Stovall. (See Appendix C.)

B. Pilot Guidelines for Coordination of Financial Aid for Distance Learning Students Enrolled at Multiple Institutions

Dr. Jeandron expressed concern that the guidelines did not state that students should look at a given institution’s concurrent enrollment policy and degree specifications when applying for financial aid in these instances; Mr. Killebrew replied that such scrutiny is the responsibility of the university’s registrar and should be conducted on an ad hoc basis. Dr. Moffett and Ms. Denise Decuir confirmed that drafts of the pilot guidelines were reviewed by registrars. Mr. Killebrew stressed that the guidelines are to be piloted. The pilot guidelines were then approved on motion by Dr. Joseph, seconded by Dr. Moffet. (See Appendix D.)

V. Discussion Regarding Projected New Policies for Statewide General Education Requirements and Defining Undergraduate Degree Programs

Mr. Killebrew laid out the rationale and design of new statewide general education requirements and directed attention also to visual representations of these guidelines that had been constructed for the occasion (online at <http://198.176.252.119/CAO/Gened>). After a brief period of question and answer, Mr. Killebrew appointed a committee to review the projected new policies composed of Drs. Birkett, Hughes, Landry, and Mills. The review committee is to meet at the end of the month for further discussion.

VI. Upcoming Program Reviews - Existing/Proposed Doctoral Programs in Speech/Language/Hearing Sciences

Mr. Killebrew informed the Council that an external team is being put together currently to review the existing Ph.D. program at LSU and proposed Ph.D. program at ULL; campus visits are expected for sometime in March. Louisiana Tech has already submitted a proposal for a new Doctor of Audiology program; additional proposals from LSU and the LSUHSC are expected by the end of January. The selection process for consultants to review these proposals will begin immediately thereafter.

VII. Update on Pilot Computer Articulation System

Mr. Killebrew informed the Council that contractual agreement between LSU and the Board of Regents for the second phase of the computerized articulation system is still pending.

VIII. Roundtable Discussion

Discussion revolved around a Louisiana law requiring pre-service teachers to take the PRAXIS exam before graduating from a teacher preparation program. The law does not require students to pass it. Several Council members queried the staff as to whether there was a way that the Board could mandate passing the exam before graduating. Mr. Killebrew noted that existing legislation refers the Regents to recommendations of the Council of Deans of Colleges of Education for advise and input in such matters. As such, the Council could issue a statement which the Board of Regents could then endorse. Dr. Burns offered to draft such a statement and present it to the Council of Deans for immediate approval. There was no further discussion.

IX. Date and Time for Next Meeting

There will be no meeting of the SCCAO later this month to allow academic offers the opportunity to participate in the PK-16+ Coordinators orientation scheduled for January 25-26. It is likely that a meeting will be scheduled for March at the usual time/date after the Board of Regents' meeting.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Killebrew adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

APPENDIX A

MINUTES

STATEWIDE COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (SCCAO)

Thursday, August 24, 2000

I. Call to Order

Dr. Carolyn Hargrave called the meeting to order at 10:55 a.m. Dr. Hargrave noted that this would be her last meeting as Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs and thanked the Council for its guidance and assistance during her tenure.

II. Approval of Minutes of June 22, 2000 Meeting

Since there were no suggestions for changes to the minutes of the June 22, 2000 meeting of the Council, the minutes were approved as distributed. (See Appendix A.) Dr. Hargrave noted that the packet of materials for the meeting included copies of follow-up letters which the Council requested be sent to the Board of Regents expressing the Council's opinion on several pending matters.

III. Roundtable Presentations

An opportunity was provided for each academic officer to describe briefly activities and initiatives on their respective campuses. Several campuses indicated searches for new academic deans, increases in program accreditations, and facilities developments.

IV. Updates

A. Program Collaboratives

Mr. Killebrew observed that annual reports for program collaboratives were due August 1, 2000 and that four reports were still outstanding. The staff will make a report to the Regents once all reports have been received and reviewed.

B. Low-Completer Programs

Mr. Killebrew referred Council members to an interim staff report regarding numbers of completers in 40 low-completer programs still under review. He noted that only 5 of these 40 programs have met Regents' completer requirements so far. As the Regents are scheduled to reconsider the status of these programs next year, Dr. Hargrave urged academic officers to initiate appropriate steps now to correct program deficiencies.

**Chief Academic Officers Meeting
Minutes, August 24, 2000**

C. LUMCON Review

Mr. Killebrew noted that the Board of Regents has engaged the services of out-of-state consultants to assess the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium during October 4-7, 2000. Campuses which have ongoing academic/research interests with LUMCON have already submitted documentation outlining their interrelationships. These campuses are invited to participate further in this review process if they wish to do so.

D. Doctoral Programs In Communication Disorders

In addition to program proposals already forthcoming from ULL and Louisiana Tech, the LSU Health Science Center plans to develop a proposal for a new doctoral program in communication disorders. Given the projected timing for submittal of these proposals and also self-review documentation from LSU's existing Ph.D. program, it is anticipated that a comprehensive review of existing and proposed new doctoral programs in communication disorders will occur in early 2001.

E. Status of Pending Proposed Programs, Letters of Intent, and Academic/Research Units

Mr. Killebrew referred Council members to a chart which lists proposals for proposed new academic programs, letters on intent, and academic/research units which have been received by the Division of Academic Affairs. This chart also projects when these proposals will be brought to the Regents for consideration. Any errors in the chart should be referred to Mr. Killebrew.

F. Professional Program Accreditation

Dr. Stephen Scott reviewed changes to Academic Affairs Policy 2.13 - Professional Program Accreditation, approved today by the Regents. A draft of a composite list of program accreditations by institution will be sent to all campuses shortly for verification.

G. Distance Education Initiatives

Mr. Mike Abbiatti updated Council members on the RFP for Distance Education Grants which emphasizes statewide academic issues such as electronic delivery of the Regents' general education requirements, articulation between two- and four-year institutions, academic service to underserved areas, etc. Dr. Hargrave encouraged academic officers to use this opportunity to accomplish these and other related goals to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. Abbiatti also discussed Louisiana's participation in the nationwide MERLOT project, the Regents' Electronic Campus, and efforts of the Electronic Learning Committee to define "seat-time" for electronically delivered coursework. Chief Academic Officers will be requested to nominate faculty for participation in MERLOT discipline teams.

Chief Academic Officers Meeting Minutes, August 24, 2000

H. Louisiana Library Network

Dr. Hargrave observed that Council members had been provided several documents concerning recent activities of the Louisiana Library Network (LOUIS). She noted that the Regents is considering augmenting the FY 2000-2001 budget for LOUIS with an additional \$150,000 in discretionary funds. This supplementary amount, along with cost savings resulting from the State Library assuming costs for its own databases, will be utilized to acquire additional LOUIS databases. Dr. Hargrave observed that a major goal for the near future will be the purchase of new software to drive the LOUIS database management system. While Dr. Hargrave promised her assistance in the development of a plan for new software even after her retirement, active support of the Council will be needed to realize this goal.

I. FY 1999-2000 Annual Report of the Division of Academic Affairs

Dr. Hargrave referred Council members to a copy of the FY 1999-2000 Annual Report of the Division of Academic Affairs which was presented to the Regents today.

J. Draft FY 2000-2001 Goals and Objectives for the Division of Academic Affairs

Dr. Hargrave referred Council members to a draft copy of FY 2000-2001 Goals and Objectives of the Division of Academic Affairs which was presented to the Regents today. She noted that the content of this draft plan will likely change when a new Deputy Commissioner for Academic Affairs is appointed.

V. Statewide General Education Matrix

Dr. Anthony Monta noted that several members of the Articulation Committee of the Council have expressed concern that transfer agreements represented by the Board of Regents' General Education Articulation Matrix have not been followed completely during student advisement. The Committee recommended, and the Council unanimously approved, the following statement of support for standardized use of the Matrix:

Recognizing the importance of publicizing clear and current General Education articulation agreements between institutions, the Statewide Council of Chief Academic Officers wants it to be known that it regards the Board of Regents' General Education Articulation Matrix as a principal means for achieving that clarity. Furthermore, to promote the stature and stability of those agreements, the Council encourages institutions with courses listed in the Matrix to regard all agreements and stipulations therein as binding in the year of their publication.

Academic officers will be requested to distribute the above endorsement to appropriate individuals on campus when the new Matrix is released.

**Chief Academic Officers Meeting
Minutes, August 24, 2000**

VI. Report on Teacher Education Initiatives

A. Title II Grant Award

Dr. Jeanne Burns referred Council members to a copy of the press release announcing the selection of *Louisiana QUEST (Quality Education for Students and Teachers)* for funding by the U.S. Department of Education Title II Teacher Quality State Enhancement Program.

The focus of first-year activities under this grant will be the formation of PK-16 Councils on each campus offering teacher education programs; the appointment of a PK-16 Coordinator to oversee reform activities; the development of necessary technological infrastructure; and planning for redesign of undergraduate teacher education curricula.

Dr. Burns noted that an RFP will be issued within a few weeks describing funding opportunities for subgrants to affected colleges and universities to accomplish reform activities noted above. The RFP will be designed so that each campus will be provided monies, if RFP directions are followed. The term of the first-year subgrants shall be November 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001. The second-year RFP shall be issued in March-April, 2001 and subsequent subgrants awarded through this RFP will run from July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002.

B. Blue Ribbon Commission Update/Schedule of Activities for 2000-2001

Dr. Burns noted that the first meeting of the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2000-2001 will occur Thursday, September 21, 2000. A complete schedule for all future Commission meetings was provided. (See Appendix B.) To the greatest extent possible, information and documentation of the Commission meetings will be provided on the web at sites provided by the Governor's Office, the Board of Regents, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the State Department of Education.

C. Accountability System Update

Dr. Burns referred Council members to documentation which describes activities of the Accountability Committee of the Blue Ribbon Commission, including the involvement of Dr. Rich Hill. She noted that particulars regarding requirements of the accountability system are still being discussed in broad terms, but that at a minimum, the system will include an assessment model which addresses all Title II requirements and responds to perceived additional needs as identified by the Commission. A proposed draft is scheduled for consideration at the September 21st meeting of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

D. Draft New Academic Affairs Policy and Accompanying Guidelines

Mr. Killebrew presented to the Council a draft of proposed new Academic Affairs Policy 2.14 - Teacher Preparation Programs and accompanying Guidelines. (See Appendix C.) The draft policy/guidelines was developed in response to the 1999-2000 Report of the Blue Ribbon Commission which requires certain actions by the Board of Regents and colleges/universities that offer teacher

Chief Academic Officers Meeting Minutes, August 24, 2000

preparation programs. The draft policy/guidelines was discussed in depth with members of the Teacher Education Committee of the Council during telephone conferences in August and some changes have already been made. Mr. Killebrew requested that each academic officer review the draft policy/guidelines with appropriate academic administrators on their respective campuses and inform him of any recommended changes by September 10th. A final draft will be sent, and responses requested, shortly thereafter so that this item may be brought to the Board of Regents for action at its September 28th meeting.

VII. Adjournment

Prior to adjournment, Dr. Kenneth Rea, speaking for the entire Council, congratulated Dr. Hargrave on her retirement and expressed appreciation for her many years of diligent service to the State of Louisiana.

There being no further business, Dr. Hargrave adjourned the meeting at 1:05 p.m.

APPENDIX B

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Indicators</p> <p>1. What indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth?</p> <p><i>Note: Each of the three areas (e.g., Teacher Quantity, Institutional Performance, and Authentic University-School Partnerships) will receive a weight of 1/3 in the rating system.</i></p>	<p>The following indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth.</p> <p>Teacher Quantity:</p> <p>Q1 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers relative to a predetermined <i>program completer target</i>.</p> <p>Q2 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> (i.e., mathematics, science, mild/moderate special education, and middle school certification) and <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i> (i.e., five rural districts identified by the state with the largest percentage of uncertified teachers).</p> <p>Q3 Number of <i>racial minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers and number of <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p>Institutional Performance:</p> <p>P1 Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests.</p> <p>P2 Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching.</p> <p>P3 Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers.</p> <p>P4 Retention rates of traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p>Authentic University-School Partnerships:</p> <p>A1 Improvement in growth targets in Professional Development Schools for K-12 School Accountability System.</p> <p>A2 Other indicators (to be determined).</p>

<p><i>Phase-in Schedule of Indicators</i></p> <p>2. When will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Scores?</p>	<p>Not all indicators will be available for the system at the same time. As a result, the system will start with a limited number of variables, add some the second and third years, and reach its final state in 2003-2004. Because all indicators will be appropriately indexed, a program's score in one year will be comparable to that of previous years even though the previous years' scores contained only a subset of the indicators. A phase-in schedule has been provided below:</p> <table> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 370 701 391">2000-2001</td><td data-bbox="785 370 2001 656"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers relative to a predetermined <i>program completer target</i>. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> and number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i>. (1999- 2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (c) Number of <i>racial minority</i> and <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers. (1999-2000 program completer cohort). (d) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>traditional</i> program completers) </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 691 701 712">2001-2002</td><td data-bbox="785 691 2001 977"> <p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (b) Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (c) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>alternate certification</i> program completers) </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 1013 701 1034">2002-2003</td><td data-bbox="785 1013 2001 1136"> <p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Achievement of growth targets of Professional Development Schools. (b) Other (to be determined) indicators for authentic university-school partnerships. </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 1172 701 1193">2003-2004</td><td data-bbox="785 1172 2001 1295"> <p>Phase-in the following indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Retention of program completers at the end of their third year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 1331 701 1352">Future Cycle</td><td data-bbox="785 1331 2001 1352"> <p>Phase in K-12 student achievement data.</p> </td></tr> </table>	2000-2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers relative to a predetermined <i>program completer target</i>. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> and number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i>. (1999- 2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (c) Number of <i>racial minority</i> and <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers. (1999-2000 program completer cohort). (d) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>traditional</i> program completers) 	2001-2002	<p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (b) Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (c) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>alternate certification</i> program completers) 	2002-2003	<p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Achievement of growth targets of Professional Development Schools. (b) Other (to be determined) indicators for authentic university-school partnerships. 	2003-2004	<p>Phase-in the following indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Retention of program completers at the end of their third year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). 	Future Cycle	<p>Phase in K-12 student achievement data.</p>
2000-2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers relative to a predetermined <i>program completer target</i>. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> and number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i>. (1999- 2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). (c) Number of <i>racial minority</i> and <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers. (1999-2000 program completer cohort). (d) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>traditional</i> program completers) 										
2001-2002	<p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (b) Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort) (c) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (1999-2000 <i>alternate certification</i> program completers) 										
2002-2003	<p>Phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Achievement of growth targets of Professional Development Schools. (b) Other (to be determined) indicators for authentic university-school partnerships. 										
2003-2004	<p>Phase-in the following indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Retention of program completers at the end of their third year of teaching. (1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort). 										
Future Cycle	<p>Phase in K-12 student achievement data.</p>										

<p>Definitions of Indicators</p> <p>3. How will specific indicators be defined?</p>	<p>a. Critical Shortages</p> <p><i>Critical Certification Shortage:</i> A <i>critical certification shortage</i> will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers reported to the BOR who meet all program and state requirements to be certified to teach in the following areas: Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, Mild/Moderate Special Education, Mathematics, and Middle School.</p> <p><i>Critical Rural District Shortage:</i> The <i>critical rural district shortage</i> will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who select to teach in the following rural school districts who have the greatest percentage of uncertified teachers: Red River; East Feliciana; St. Helena; Madison; and Assumption.</p> <p>The sum will be a “duplicated” count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as “Mathematics” and teaching in “Red River School District” would count as two, not one.</p> <p>b. Number of Minority Graduates</p> <p><i>Racial Minority:</i> A <i>racial minority</i> will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) African-American. (2) Asian-American. (3) Hispanic. (4) Native American. (5) Pacific Islander. <p><i>Teaching Minority:</i> A <i>teaching minority</i> will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:</p> <p>(1) Male and taking the “Early Childhood Education” test OR (2) Male and taking the “Elementary Education” test.</p> <p>The sum will be a “duplicated” count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as “African-American” and “male taking the Early Childhood Education test” would count as two, not one.</p> <p>c. Rating by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs</p> <p>A survey will be developed and field-tested during spring of 2001 with 1998-99 program completers. The survey will examine teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their programs in preparing them for their first year of teaching in a school setting. This survey will be mailed to all teachers who completed a program the previous year and are teaching in a public or private school in Louisiana. A program’s raw score on the teacher survey will be the mean score across all questions for all questionnaires returned. Once standards have been established for scores on the survey, raw scores will be converted to a Teacher Survey Index.</p>
--	--

<p>Definitions of Indicators</p> <p>3. How will specific indicators be defined? (Cont'd)</p>	<p>d. Rating by building level assessors of the quality of the preparation of second year teachers</p> <p>The survey will be completed by building level assessors that will be observing and assisting first year teachers in public schools throughout the state. This survey will be developed and field-tested during the spring of 2001 with 1998-99 program completers and will contain questions that examine building level assessors' perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher's programs in preparing teachers for their first year of teaching. A program's raw score on the survey will be the mean score across all questions for all questionnaires returned. Once standards have been established for scores on the survey, raw scores will be converted to an Assessor Survey Index.</p> <p>e. Retention of teachers</p> <p>The retention rate of teachers will be calculated by examining the number of program completers who are teaching in a Louisiana school three years after graduation, divided by the number of completers who started teaching in a Louisiana school the fall after graduation less the number who have moved out of state.</p>								
<p>Overall Scores</p> <p>4. How will the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score be calculated?</p>	<p>A key component of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is <i>single composite scores</i> for individual universities, called <i>Teacher Preparation Performance Scores</i>. The calculation of these scores will be based upon a formula that examines how well universities perform on each of the indicators.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 831 730 893">2000-2001 & 2001-2002</td><td data-bbox="882 831 1879 893">The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity and the average index for Institutional Performance divided by two.</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td data-bbox="882 928 1995 990"> $\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index}}{2}$ </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="592 1026 730 1088">2002 -2003 & Beyond</td><td data-bbox="882 1026 1995 1120">The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity, the average index for Institutional Performance, and the average index for Authentic University-District Partnerships divided by three.</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td data-bbox="882 1156 1995 1250"> $\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index} + \text{University-District Partnership Index}}{3}$ </td></tr> </table>	2000-2001 & 2001-2002	The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity and the average index for Institutional Performance divided by two.		$\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index}}{2}$	2002 -2003 & Beyond	The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity, the average index for Institutional Performance, and the average index for Authentic University-District Partnerships divided by three.		$\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index} + \text{University-District Partnership Index}}{3}$
2000-2001 & 2001-2002	The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity and the average index for Institutional Performance divided by two.								
	$\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index}}{2}$								
2002 -2003 & Beyond	The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity, the average index for Institutional Performance, and the average index for Authentic University-District Partnerships divided by three.								
	$\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index} + \text{University-District Partnership Index}}{3}$								

<p><i>Formula to Calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Scores</i></p> <p>5. What formula will be used to calculate the Teacher Quantity Index and Institutional Performance Index?</p>	<p>The formula that will be used to calculate the Teacher Quantity Index will be the following:</p> $\text{Teacher Quantity Index} = \frac{\text{Program Completers} + .5 * (\text{Certification Shortage} + \text{Rural Shortage} + \text{Racial Minority} + \text{Teaching Minority})}{\text{Program Completer Target}}$ <p>The formula that will be used to calculate the Institutional Performance Index will be the following:</p> $\text{Institutional Performance Index} = \frac{\text{Certification Index} + \text{Graduate Satisfaction Index} + \text{Assessor Survey Index} + \text{Retention Index}}{4}$ <p>Raw data will be converted on a scale so that Quality/Exemplary results will be 125 and At-Risk/Satisfactory results will be 80.</p>
<p><i>Program Completer Targets</i></p> <p>6. How will the <i>program completer targets</i> be established?</p>	<p>The Board of Regents will establish a goal for program completers for the entire state. This goal, when divided by the number of program completers in 1997-98, will establish a percentage increase needed for the state as a whole. This percentage increase will be multiplied by each institution's 1997-98 number of program completers to establish an initial program completer target for each institution.</p> <p>The Board of Regents will establish a review panel consisting of consultants from outside Louisiana to hear requests from institutions to have their program completer targets adjusted. The panel, upon consideration of the information provided to them, will adjust any institution's program completer target. However, the total of the targets across all institutions must equal the original total for the state established by the Board of Regents.</p> <p>Once the program completer targets have been established, an institution, upon the event of a significant change in its organizational structure, may appeal to the Board of Regents to have its program completer target changed. If the Board of Regents approves the change, this decision will not affect the program completer target for any other institution.</p>

Labels for Teacher Preparation Programs

7. How should labels be assigned to Teacher Preparation Programs?

Teacher Preparation Performance Scores will range from 0 to beyond 100, with a score of 100-124.9 indicating that a university possesses a Quality program. All universities will be expected to achieve a Teacher Preparation Performance Score of 100 and achieve a “Quality” status by April 1, 2005.

April 1, 2001

On April 1 (2001), universities will be given one of the following two labels based upon their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. This will be a baseline year for all universities.

Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 80.0 and above.
Below Satisfactory Teacher Preparation program	=	Performance Score at or below 79.9.

April 1, 2002 & Beyond

On April 1 (2002 & beyond), universities will be assigned specific labels each year based upon the level of their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. For the first four years (April 1, 2001-April 1, 2005), the following scores will need to be achieved in order to receive each of the following labels:

Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 125.0 and above
Quality Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 100.0 -124.9
Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 80.0 - 99.9
At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 50.0 - 79.9
Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 0 - 49.9

After 2001-2005, it is intended that the scores required to receive each label will increase over time. Beginning with 2005-2006, there will be a revised schedule of scores associated with the labels. Universities will be expected to demonstrate additional growth to meet the new criteria and maintain the labels.

<p>Rewards</p> <p>8. Should universities be rewarded for high performance and/or growth?</p>	<p>Universities should receive rewards if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of “Exemplary” or “Quality”. They should also receive a reward if they have a “Satisfactory” label and demonstrate a predetermined amount of growth. Types of rewards should be:</p> <p>Exemplary Teacher Preparation Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a positive label. b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize accomplishments. c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculties. e. Universities receive fellowship funds for students in graduate programs. <p><i>Quality Teacher Preparation Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a positive label. b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize universities. c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculty. <p><i>Teacher Preparation Programs Labeled as Satisfactory the Previous Year Whose Teacher Preparation Scores Increase by a Predetermined Number of Points in One Year.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a positive label. b. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. c. Universities receive institutional grants to support improvement efforts.
---	--

<p>Corrective Actions</p> <p>9. What will happen when a university obtains an “At-risk Teacher Preparation Program” label or an “Unacceptable Teacher preparation Program” label?</p> <p>(NOTE: Movement to a lower level will be based upon cumulative years. Thus, if a university labeled as “At-risk” spends one year in Level 1, moves to “Satisfactory” the next year, moves back to “At-risk” the next, and does not reach “Satisfactory” the next year, the university will move to Level 2 corrective action due to the fact that it had an “At-risk” label for a total of two years.)</p>	<p>Universities should receive corrective actions if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of “At-risk” or “Low Performing”. Types of corrective actions are the following..</p> <p><i>For At-risk Teacher Preparation Programs Only</i></p> <p><i>Level 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive an “At-risk” label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Universities obtain an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Councils to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.* c. Universities report recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public. d. Universities report progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis. e. Universities have two years to reach “Satisfactory” level. <p><i>Level 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive an “At-risk” label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Board of Regents refuse to approve new university programs in colleges that offer general education and major courses to teacher education majors. c. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education assign private universities a “probationary status” as part of the state approval process. d. Universities have one year to move to “Satisfactory” level. Universities that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions. <p><i>For Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs or At-Risk Teacher Preparation Programs that Fail to Demonstrate Growth During Level 2 Corrective Actions</i></p> <p><i>Level 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a “Low Performing” label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Universities are assigned an external team (funded by universities) to assist the program. c. Universities contact students to inform them of the status and plans to improve the teacher preparation program. d. Universities have two years to move to a “Satisfactory” level. (Note: Universities that have had an “At-risk” label for three years will have only one year to move to a “Satisfactory” level before moving to Level 4.) <p><i>Note: See next page for Level 4 corrective action.</i></p>
--	--

* Board of Regents will compile a list of “experts” to work with the universities. The universities may select from the list or hire another expert with similar expertise.

<p>Corrective Actions (Cont'd)</p> <p>9. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or an "Unacceptable Teacher preparation Program" label?</p>	<p>Level 4:</p> <p>a. Universities lose state approval of teacher preparation programs.</p>
<p>Non-approval</p> <p>10. What will happen once a university moves into Level 4 correction action?</p>	<p>Once a university reaches Level 4 of the corrective actions, the program will no longer be approved by the state. If the university wishes to reconstitute the program, it may not submit a plan for a new program until a minimum of one year is spent planning the reconstituted program.</p> <p>Once a university loses its program approval, it may accept no new students into the teacher preparation program. Students already enrolled in the non-approved teacher preparation program may complete their program at the university and be employed in the state. A non-approved institution is expected to work with approved institutions and help students transfer credits to approved universities providing the students meet admission requirements at the approved universities.</p> <p>The performance of students from non-approved institutions who enter approved institutions during their final 30 hours will not be calculated into the Teacher Preparation Performance Score of the approved institutions.</p>
<p>Quality Status Not Reached in Four Years</p> <p>11. What happens if a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "Quality" status in four years?</p>	<p>If a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "Quality" by April 1 (2005), the following will occur:</p> <p>a. University obtains an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Council to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.</p> <p>b. University reports recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public.</p> <p>c. University reports progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis.</p>

APPENDIX C

PROPOSED SEAT-TIME POLICY FOR ACADEMIC COURSEWORK

CURRENT BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

(Master Plan for Higher Education, Board of Regents, State of Louisiana, April 1994, p. 99)

Classes should meet for not less than 36 clock hours of instruction. This number of clock hours should be considered an absolute minimum. All class periods must be of reasonable length (1-4 hours). Chronologically, the course should be of such duration and with enough time between classes that students have adequate time to reflect, consider, evaluate, and absorb the ideas, concepts, and the values that constitute the course. Traditionally, in American higher education, the time/credit hours ration has been no less than one week per semester credit hour earned.

PROPOSED NEW BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

State System institutions have long recognized that college-level learning may be acquired in a variety of settings and can be documented objectively and comprehensively through written or performance examinations and other academically sound procedures. A traditional example used to determine course length has been that three semester hour classes have met for not less than 36 clock hours of instruction. With the growth in recent years in distance education, the introduction of technology in delivering instruction, and the increase in the number of readings/special topic courses and independent study courses, the nature of contact hours has changed and requires greater flexibility. All classes must be of reasonable length and include both content and contact sufficient to maintain high academic quality and standards commensurate with credit hours awarded for a "traditional" three-semester hour lecture class. The basis for such certification of learning is a valid, credible assessment system which reliably determines whether a student possesses clearly identified, standards-based knowledge, skills, and abilities.

APPENDIX D

PILOT GUIDELINES FOR COORDINATION OF FINANCIAL AID FOR DISTANCE LEARNING STUDENTS ENROLLED AT MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS

For purposes of these guidelines, “Primary Institution” shall be defined as the institution at which an individual is enrolled as a degree-seeking student. “Secondary Institution” is defined as any institution at which an individual is simultaneously enrolled in one or more courses, but is not considered a degree-seeking student.

- 1. A student who meets the requirements for enrollment at both the primary and secondary institutions will be eligible to take distance-learning courses. Students must be enrolled in an eligible degree program at the primary institution to be eligible for federal financial aid. Both the primary and secondary institution(s) must be Title IV eligible.**
- 2. Distance learning students will follow the academic calendar and academic policies of the institution at which the course(s) is/are being taught. The primary institution will notify the student that he/she is responsible for becoming familiar with both institutions’ calendar and policies.**
- 3. The primary institution will access coursework completed through distance education, as appropriate, to determine the satisfactory progress of the affected student.**
- 4. Distance learning students will register and pay all applicable tuition and fees at both the primary institution and secondary institution(s).**
- 5. Financial Aid for distance learning students will only be processed and awarded at the primary institution. Hours attempted at both the primary and secondary institutions will be used in the determination of eligibility for federal financial aid at the primary institution.**
- 6. Students enrolled at a primary institution which utilizes a quarter-based system, but also taking coursework at a secondary institution(s) which utilizes a semester-based system, will have the semester school enrollments at the secondary institution(s) credited to their financial aid hours only in the Fall and Spring quarters at the primary institution. The primary institution will determine if any adjustment in a student’s financial aid cost-of-attendance is applicable. The primary institution will determine if any adjustment to financial aid award is required if course work at the primary or secondary institution(s) is (are) measured in different units. (Semester Hours/Quarter Hours equivalents).**
- 7. Registrars and financial aid officers will identify students who enroll in multiple institutions via distance learning technologies and communicate this information among affected institutions. Any change in enrollment status of a student enrolled in coursework at a secondary institution(s) will immediately be communicated to the primary institution. The primary institution will determine the applicable refund policy and/or adjustments to financial aid for students who fail to attend/participate, drop, or resign during an applicable period. The federal Return of Title IV Funds policy will be followed by the**

primary institution.